



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Kim Connor: Professional conduct panel outcome

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the
Secretary of State for Education**

October 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher:	Ms Kim Connor
Teacher ref number:	9553592
Teacher date of birth:	13 December 1973
TRA reference:	19556
Date of determination:	14 October 2022
Former employer:	St Monica's RC High School, Greater Manchester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 14 October 2022 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Kim Connor.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist) and Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Natalie Kent of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Amalea Bourne of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Ms Connor was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 2 August 2022.

It was alleged that Ms Connor was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 5 March 2020 she was convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of the following offences;
 - a) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 - 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment and placed on the Sex Offenders Notice for a period of 10 years.
 - b) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.
 - c) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.
 - d) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting a female aged 13-17 to engage in sexual activity when she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.
 - e) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting a female aged 13-17 to engage in sexual activity when she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04- 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s. 17(1) (e) (i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.
 - f) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting sexual activity with a female aged 13-17 when she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i) for which she was sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.

Ms Connor admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) to (f) as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 12 May 2022, and the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Connor on 4 October 2022, although Ms Connor had previously denied the allegations.

Ms Connor further admitted that the facts of those admitted allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

Application to proceed in the absence of the teacher

Ms Connor was not present at the hearing nor was she represented. The presenting officer made an application to proceed in the absence of Ms Connor.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to in it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones [2003] 1 AC 1* (as considered and applied in subsequent cases, particularly *GMC v Adeogba*).

The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings had been sent to Ms Connor in accordance with the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020 (the '2020 Procedures').

The panel concluded that Ms Connor's absence was voluntary and that she was aware that the matter would proceed and that the panel may make findings against in her absence.

The panel noted that Ms Connor had not sought an adjournment to the hearing and the panel did not consider that an adjournment would procure her attendance at a hearing. There was no medical evidence before the panel that Ms Connor was unfit to attend the hearing. The panel considered that it was in the public interest for the hearing to take place.

Having decided that it was appropriate to proceed, the panel agreed to seek to ensure that the proceedings were as fair as possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind that Ms Connor was neither present nor represented.

Application to admit additional documents

The panel considered a preliminary application from the presenting officer for the admission of additional documents.

The presenting officer's documents consisted of correspondence with the teacher in respect of the TRA's applications to proceed in the absence of the teacher and to amend the allegations.

The documents subject to the application had not been served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.37 of the 2020 Procedures. Therefore, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the 2020 Procedures.

The panel heard representations from the presenting officer in respect of the application. The presenting officer submitted that the additional documents demonstrate that Ms Connor will not be attending and that she understands the repercussions of non-attendance and that these documents were therefore relevant to the panel's considerations. The additional documents also evidence Ms Connor's agreement to the amendment to the allegation as dealt with in the presenting officer's further application.

The panel considered the additional documents were relevant and that they would not amount to unfairness to the teacher. Accordingly, the documents were added to the bundle.

Application to amend allegations

The presenting officer made an application to amend the stem of the allegations to change the date of conviction from 7 July 2020 to 5 March 2020.

The panel noted that Ms Connor had been informed of the proposed change to the allegations.

The panel was advised that it had the power to amend allegations in accordance with paragraph 5.83 of the 2020 Procedures.

The panel considered that the proposed amendment would not change the nature and scope of the allegations and that the amendment was to rectify a factual matter. As such, the panel considered that the proposed amendment did not amount to a material change to the allegations.

The legal adviser drew the panel's attention to the case of *Dr Bashir Ahmedsowida v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 3466 (Admin), 2021 WL 06064095* which held that the lateness of amendments did not necessarily mean they were unjust, as acknowledged in the previous case of *Professional Standards Authority v Health and Care Professions Council and Doree [2017] EWCA Civ 319 at [56]*.

Accordingly, the panel did grant this application and considered the amended allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

- Section 1: Chronology – page 4
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of hearing – pages 6 to 49
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 51 to 55
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 57 to 79
- Section 5: Teacher documents – none provided

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Additional correspondence between the TRA and the teacher – pages 80 to 109

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to provide oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Ms Connor was employed as a performing arts teacher at St Monica's RC High School ('the School') from 1996 until 2015. In 2015, Ms Connor taught for one term at Stockport Academy before returning to the School in 2016, where she worked up until March 2018 when she was suspended.

Between 30 September 2004 and 31 December 2004, alleged sexual misconduct took place between Ms Connor and a pupil when the pupil was [REDACTED]. The relationship continued and ended when the pupil was [REDACTED].

As a result of the above, on 5 March 2020, a criminal trial took place and Ms Connor was convicted of 3 counts of sexual activity with a child in a position of trust and 3 counts of causing or inciting a child by a person in a position of trust to engage in sexual activity.

Ms Connor was later sentenced to 9 months imprisonment to run concurrently as well as being placed on the sexual offenders register for 10 years.

The DBS referred the matter to the TRA on 5 October 2020.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On or around 5 March 2020 you were convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of the following offences;**
 - a) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 - 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment and placed on the Sex Offenders Notice for a period of 10 years.**
 - b) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.**
 - c) Abuse of Position of Trust: Sexual Activity with a female aged 13-17 where you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.16(1)(e)(i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.**
 - d) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting a female aged 13-17 to engage in sexual activity when you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04 – 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.**
 - e) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting a female aged 13-17 to engage in sexual activity when you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04- 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s. 17(1) (e) (i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.**
 - f) Abuse of Position of Trust: Causing/inciting sexual activity with a female aged 13-17 when you did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 on 30/09/04**

– 31/12/04 contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i) for which you were sentenced on 07 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment concurrent.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Connor on 4 October 2022. In that statement of agreed facts, Ms Connor admitted that she was convicted of 4 offences of sexual activity with a female aged 13-17 whom she did not believe to be over the age of 18 years old and 2 offences of causing/inciting sexual activity with a female aged 13-17 where she did not believe the victim was over the age of 18 years old. Ms Connor admitted that she was sentenced to 9 months imprisonment to run concurrently for the offences and further, it was admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted that the statement of agreed facts as signed on 4 October 2022 listed the incorrect configuration of offences, being 4 offences of sexual activity and 2 offences of causing/inciting sexual activity, whereas the certificate of conviction listed 3 offences of sexual activity and 3 offences of causing/inciting sexual activity. Despite this, Ms Connor had earlier admitted the allegations as set out correctly within the response to the notice of referral dated 12 May 2022. On this basis, the panel was satisfied that Ms Connor admitted the allegations.

Ms Connor acknowledged that she did not appeal the conviction in the criminal courts. However, she wished to record that she does not agree with the convictions. The panel also noted that Ms Connor had pled not guilty within the criminal trial but had subsequently been found guilty and sentenced.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Manchester Minshull Street Crown Court, which had been amended by a final amended certificate of conviction or finding, which detailed that Ms Connor had been convicted of 3 counts of "*sexual activity with a girl 13-17 offender no belief she is 18 – abuse of position of trust*" and 3 counts of "*cause/incite sexual activity with a girl 13 to 17 of abuse of position of trust – not s.21 premises – offender 18 or over*".

In respect of the allegations, Ms Connor was sentenced at Manchester Minshull Street Crown Court on 7 July 2020 to 9 months imprisonment to run concurrently. In addition, she was placed on the sex offenders register pursuant to section 92 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, for 10 years.

On examination of the documents before the panel, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 1(a) to (f) were proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Connor, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Connor was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Connor's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Ms Connor's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity, which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction, and in particular that it involved sexual activity with a child who was and had previously been a pupil in her care, was relevant to Ms Connor's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so.

The panel were aware that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Connor, which involved a finding that there had been conviction for 3 counts of sexual activity with a child in a position of trust and 3 counts of causing/inciting a child by a person in a position of trust to engage in sexual activity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the extremely serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Connor was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Connor was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Connor.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Ms Connor. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- any abuse of any trust, knowledge or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- violating of the rights of pupils;
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Ms Connor's actions were not deliberate, in fact the panel noted the Judge's sentencing remarks which stated, "*These were not isolated incidents. [the Pupil] was groomed and manipulated.*"

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Connor was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, the panel found Ms Connor's actions to be calculated and motivated.

No evidence was submitted to attest to Ms Connor's history or ability as a teacher. Nor was any evidence submitted which demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Ms Connor has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted the sentencing remarks submitted as part of the bundle, which noted that Ms Connor was a "*mature lady of good character*". Further, the judge commented that Ms Connor was, "*an inspirational teacher who had devoted herself, for nearly a quarter of a century, to the betterment of others and opening the eyes of young people to the arts.*" The judge referred to character references that had been read to the jury,

stating that “*nobody who heard that plethora of references read to the jury by Mr. Gurney could not have been moved*”.

The panel also noted that the sentencing remarks explained that Ms Connor [REDACTED] and that Ms Connor accepted, to a limited degree, that her relationship with the pupil was inappropriate. However, no mitigation evidence had been placed before the panel and therefore the panel could not take this into account.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Connor of prohibition.

The panel did not consider Ms Connor had shown insight or remorse for her actions, such that the panel determined there was a risk of repetition and therefore a continued risk to pupils.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Connor. The seriousness of the offences and the lack of insight and remorse was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Ms Connor was convicted of 3 counts of sexual activity with a child and 3 counts of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the

circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Kim Connor should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Connor is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of abuse of positions of trust.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Connor, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel did not consider Ms Connor had shown insight or remorse for her actions, such that the panel determined there was a risk of repetition and therefore a continued risk to pupils.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Connor’s behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of abuse of position of trust in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Connor herself. The panel comment “No evidence was submitted to attest to Ms Connor’s history or ability as a teacher. Nor was any evidence submitted which demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Ms Connor has contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Connor from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments, “The panel found that Ms Connor was convicted of 3 counts of sexual activity with a child and 3 counts of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Connor has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Ms Connor was convicted of 3 counts of sexual activity with a child and 3 counts of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, the factors which mean that not allowing for a review period is necessary are the serious nature of the convictions and the lack of insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Ms Kim Connor is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Kim Connor shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Ms Kim Connor has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'A. C. M.', followed by a vertical line.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 19 October 2022

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.